

APPLICANT(S): Eliezer Rachamann et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/029,543
FILED: February 26, 1998
Page 2 of 8

REMARKS

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 101:

Claims 15-40 were pending in the subject Application. In the Office Action dated May 24, 2000, the Examiner rejected claims 35, 37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. In an Amendment dated November 22, 2000, Applicants have amended claims 35, 37 and 40, thus rendering the Examiner's rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH:

In the Office Action dated May 24, 2000, the Examiner rejected Claims 15, 17, 31-40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. In the Amendment dated November 22, 2000, Applicants have amended claim 15, thus rendering the Examiner's rejection moot. Accordingly, claims 17 and 31-40 are in compliance with requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In addition, claim 30 has been amended in compliance with the Examiner's objection.

APPLICANT(S): Eliezer Rachamann et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/029,543
FILED: February 26, 1998
Page 3 of 8

Applicants maintain that the Claims are definite and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103:

In the Office Action dated May 24, 2000, the Examiner rejected Claims 15-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over Bodor, U.S. Patent No. 4,824,850 and Naito, JP 05339148.

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. In telephone conferences dated 22 May 2001 and 27 June 2001 between the Examiner and Herbert Cantor of Evenson, Mckeown, Edwards & Lenahan, the Examiner asserted that he would withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, and allow the claims.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants request allowance of the claims. Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

APPLICANT(S): Eliezer Rachamann et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/029,543
FILED: February 26, 1998
Page 4 of 8

If any other fees are due, the undersigned Attorney hereby authorizes the United States Patent and Trademark Office to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 05-0649.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark S. Cohen
Registration No. 42,425
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: February 10, 2003

Eitan, Pearl, Latzer & Cohen-Zedek
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001
New York, New York 10020
Tel: (212) 632-3480
Fax: (212) 632-3489

RECEIVED

FEB 12 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS